UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/602,020	06/24/2003	Frederic Reblewski	003921.00135	7641
22907 BANNER & W	7590 11/07/200 TTCOFF. LTD.	EXAMINER		
1100 13th STR		SAXENA, AKASH		
SUITE 1200 WASHINGTOI	N, DC 20005-4051		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		2128	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/602,020	REBLEWSKI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
AKASH SAXENA	2128		

	AKASH SAXENA	2128	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 29 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	t, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount c nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. 🛮 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b			cause
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 		E below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		cted claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.124. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mnliant Amendment (I	OTOL -324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		ripilarit Americinent (i	- 10L-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,8-10 and 16-32. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Kamini S Shah/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2128			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The rolled up claim 8 into claim 1 is not identical and represents a different scope than claim 8 filed prior to Final Office Action. Further claims 20, 29 and 31 bring in new limitations.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding Claim rejection under 35 USC 112 second - definition of the state data depends on data of interest (Para 28) and data of interest is cyclically dependent on state data (Para 36) as pointed out by applicant and therefore the argument is not persuasive.

Regarding Claim rejection under 35 USC 103:

Arguments on Pg. 9 directed to Tausheck shows "location of selected data being different when processing different packets" in Tauscheck Col. 2 Lines 20-36 stating "The controlling processor sets up the chained DMA operations and adds addresses of free buffers to the first-infirst-out memory. When performing a first chained DMA operation, the first DMA co-processor accesses

the first-in-first-out memory to allocate for itself a first buffer from the queue of buffers when a first link in the first chained DMA operation requires a buffer. When the first buffer is filled, the first DMA co-processor immediately notifies the controlling processor. When performing a second chained DMA operation, the second DMA co-processor accesses the first-in-first-out memory to allocate for itself a second buffer from the queue of buffers when a first link in the second chained DMA operation requires a buffer. When the second buffer is filled, the second DMA co-processor immediately notifies the controlling processor."

Hence the argument is unpersuasive.

For claim 20 an updated search may be required. Tauschek may teach this limitation as presented above.

For claims 29 & 31, the amended limitation would require further search and consideration. Prosecution on this case is closed.

/AS/